arXiv:1303.5139v1 [math.CO] 21 Mar 2013

The first k-regular subgraph is large

Pu Gao
University of Toronto
pu.gao@utoronto.ca

Abstract

We prove that for sufficiently large k, there exist $0 \leq \sigma_k \leq \epsilon_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, such that asymptotically almost surely the first k-regular subgraph appeared in the random graph process where one edge is added at a time has size between $(1-\epsilon_k)|\mathcal{C}_k|$ and $(1-\sigma_k)|\mathcal{C}_k|$, where $\mathcal{C}_k$ denotes the k-core of the graph.

1 Introduction

Let $\mathcal{G}(n,m)$ denote the probability space of random graphs on n vertices and m edges with the uniform distribution and let $\mathcal{G}(n,p)$ denote the binomial model of random graphs on vertex set $[n]$, where each edge occurs independently with probability p. This paper relates to the research on the existence of k-regular subgraphs of $\mathcal{G}(n,cn/2)$ (correspondingly $\mathcal{G}(n,c/n)$), when c is slightly greater than c_k, the threshold of the emergence of the k-core. It is obvious that a k-regular subgraph exists only if the k-core is non-empty, whereas the converse is not necessarily true except for $k \leq 2$. Thus, $\tilde{c}_k \geq c_k$, where $\tilde{c}_k$ is the threshold of the appearance of a k-regular subgraph. In [2], Bollobás, Kim and Verstraëte proved that $\tilde{c}_3$ is strictly greater than c_3. However, whether $\tilde{c}_k$ is strictly greater than c_k, for general $k \geq 4$, is not clear. Bollobás, Kim and Verstraëte conjectured that this strict inequality holds also for all $k \geq 4$. However, Pretti and Weigt [14] claimed the opposite: for all $k \geq 4$, c_k and $\tilde{c}_k$ are equal. Their approach uses the cavity method and some statistical physics technique. (Basically they argued that $\tilde{c}_k$ is the critical point where the entropy of some equation becomes zero and they argued that $\tilde{c}_k$ is a non-trivial solution of a certain equation, and the solution coincides with c_k, for every $k \geq 4$. In the application of the cavity method they assumed some hypothesis on the *stability of replica symmetry*, which they only managed to provide numerical evidence instead of a mathematical proof.)

The most recent progress on this are improvements of upper bounds of $\tilde{c}_k$. Prałat, Verstraëte and Wormald [12] proved that for all sufficiently large k, $\tilde{c}_k \leq c_{k+2}$ by showing that for any c slightly greater than c_{k+2}, asymptotically almost surely (a.a.s.) the $(k+2)$-core contains a k-factor (if the size of the $(k+2)$-core multiplied by k is even). More recently, Chan and Molloy [3] proved that a.a.s. the $(k+1)$-core has a k-factor, for any c slightly greater than c_{k+1}, where k is sufficiently large. Thus, the currently best known bounds of $\tilde{c}_k$ is $c_k \leq \tilde{c}_k \leq c_{k+1}$, for large k.

In this paper, we study the size of the first k-regular subgraph in the graph evolution process, defined as follows. Let $G_0, G_1, \ldots, G_{\binom{n}{2}}$ be a graph process where G_0 is an empty graph on vertex set $[n]$ and for every $1 \le i \le \binom{n}{2}$, G_i is obtained by adding one edge x to G_{i-1}, where x is uniformly at random chosen from all edges not in G_{i-1}. Therefore, $G_0 \subseteq G_1 \subseteq \cdots G_{\binom{n}{2}}$ and for every $0 \le i \le \binom{n}{2}$, G_i is distributed exactly as $\mathcal{G}(n, m)$. This random graph process was first introduced by Erdős and Rényi. For details, see [5]. Let m_k denote the minimum integer m that G_m contains a k-regular subgraph. What is the size of a typical k-regular subgraph in G_{m_k}? For $k = 3$, the observation by Pretti and Weigt [14] suggests that the first k-regular subgraph contains around 24% of vertices in G_{m_3}. (They claimed that they will identify the size of the first k-regular subgraph for general $k \ge 4$ in a following publication. But we did not find a paper on that.) In this paper, we prove that for all sufficiently large k, asymptotically almost surely (a.a.s.) the first k-regular subgraph appeared in the random graph process misses at most $\epsilon_k|\mathcal{C}_k|$ vertices of $\mathcal{C}_k$, where $\mathcal{C}_k$ is the k-core of G_{m_k} and $\epsilon_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. On the other hand, with a simple second moment argument, we can easily show that a.a.s. this k-regular subgraph must miss at least $\Omega(|\mathcal{C}_k|)$ vertices of $\mathcal{C}_k$.

It follows immediately as a corollary that for c slightly greater than c_k, if there exist some k-regular subgraphs in $\mathcal{G}(n, cn/2)$ (or $\mathcal{G}(n, c/n)$), then a.a.s. the sizes of all k-regular graphs lie between $(1-\epsilon_k)|\mathcal{C}_k|$ and $(1-\sigma_k)|\mathcal{C}_k|$, where $0 \le \sigma_k \le \epsilon_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Thus, either to rigorously prove Pretti and Weigt's prediction, or to prove the conjecture by Bollobás, Kim and Verstraëte, we only need to restrict our further investigation to the existence of k-regular subgraphs with size in a narrow range $(1-\epsilon_k)|\mathcal{C}_k|$ and $(1-\sigma_k)|\mathcal{C}_k|$, where $0 \le \sigma_k \le \epsilon_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$.

2 Main Results

Let n, M and k be positive integers such that $M \ge kn$ is even. Let $\mathcal{M}(n, M, k)$ denote the probability space of random multigraphs on vertex set $[n]$ with $M/2$ edges whose end vertices are independently and uniformly at random (u.a.r.) chosen from $[n]$, conditional on that each vertex has degree at least k. Let $\mathcal{H}(n, M, k)$ denote the probability space of $\mathcal{M}(n, M, k)$ restricted to simple graphs. It is well known (see [4]) that the k-core of $\mathcal{G}(n, p)$ is distributed as $\mathcal{H}(n', 2m', k)$, conditional on the number of vertices and edges in the k-core being n' and m'.

Given a graph G and a positive integer k, let $\mathcal{C}_k(G)$ denote the k-core of G. For a sequence of probability spaces indexed by n (e.g. $\mathcal{M}(n, M, k)$ and $\mathcal{H}(n, M, k)$), we say an event A_n is true asymptotically almost surely (a.a.s.) if the probability that A_n holds goes to 1 as $n \to \infty$. For two functions $f(n)$ and $g(n)$ of n, we write $f(n) = O(g(n))$ if there is a constant $C > 0$ such that $|f(n)| \le C|g(n)|$. We write $f(n) = o(g(n))$ if $\lim_{n\to\infty} f(n)/g(n) = 0$. All unspecified asymptotics refer to $n \to \infty$. Some asymptotics refer to $k \to \infty$. In this case, we will always specify it.

Theorem 2.1 *Let $G \sim \mathcal{H}(n, M, k)$, where $d = M/n = k + o(k)$ (as $k \to \infty$) and $d \ge k + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{k \log k}$. Then for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $K > 0$ such that provided $k \ge K$, a.a.s.*

there is no k-regular subgraph of G whose size is between ϵn and $(1-\epsilon)n$.

Theorem 2.2 *Let $k \geq 3$ be a fixed integer. Let $G \sim \mathcal{H}(n, M, k)$, where $M = O(n)$. Then there exists $\epsilon > 0$, such that a.a.s. there is no k-regular subgraph of G whose size is more than $(1-\epsilon)n$.*

Let $(G_m)_{0\leq m\leq\binom{n}{2}}$ be the random graph process defined in Section 1, and recall that m_k denotes the minimum integer m such that G_m contains a k-regular subgraph. In order to apply Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 and show the same conclusions there hold also for the k-core of G_{m_k}, we need to show that the average degree of the k-core of G_{m_k} satisfies the hypotheses of Theorems 2.1 and Theorem 2.2.

For $k \geq 3$, define

$$h_k(\mu) = \frac{\mu}{f_{k-1}(\mu)},$$

and let

$$c_k = \inf\{h_k(\mu), \mu > 0\}.$$

For any $c \geq c_k$, define $\mu_{c,k}$ to be the larger solution of $h_k(\mu) = c$. In particular, let $\mu_k = \mu_{c_k,k}$ for $k \geq 3$ and let $d_k = \mu_k f_{k-1}(\mu_k)/f_k(\mu_k)$. Pittel, Spencer and Wormald [11] determined that $c_k = k + \sqrt{k\log k} + O(\sqrt{k/\log k})$. (The error term in [11] is $O(\log n)$, and was corrected in [12]. See [12, Lemma 1] for a more precise expression of c_k.) They also determined the a.a.s. size and density of the k-core for any $c > c_k$. We cite their result as follows (in a less precise form).

Theorem 2.3 *Let $k \geq 3$ be fixed. Suppose that $c \leq c_k - n^{-1/3}$ and $m = cn/2$. Then a.a.s. $\mathcal{G}(n,m)$ has an empty k-core. Suppose $c \geq c_k + n^{-1/3}$ and $m = cn/2$. Then, a.a.s. $\mathcal{G}(n,m)$ has a non-empty k-core with $f_k(\mu_{c,k})n + o(n)$ vertices and $\frac{1}{2}\mu_{c,k}f_{k-1}(\mu_{c,k})n + o(n)$ edges. Same conclusions hold for $\mathcal{G}(n,p)$ with $p = c/n$.*

In the same paper, the estimated the size of the first k-core in the random graph process $(G_i)_{0\leq i\leq\binom{n}{2}}$ (see [11, Theorems 1 and 3]), from which we can easily deduce the following lemma (by noting that $\mu f_{k-1}(\mu)/f_k(\mu)$ is an increasing function on $\mu > 0$).

Lemma 2.4 *A.a.s. the average degree of $\mathcal{C}_k(G_{m_k})$ is at least $d_k + o(1)$.*

In the following lemma, we estimate d_k and μ_k and show that they are both close to c_k when k is large.

Lemma 2.5

$$d_k = k + \sqrt{k\log k} + O(\sqrt{k/\log k}), \quad \mu_k = k + \sqrt{k\log k} + O(\sqrt{k/\log k}), \quad f_k(\mu_k) \to 1,$$

as $k \to \infty$.

By Lemmas 2.4 and 2.5, we see that a.a.s. the average degree of $\mathcal{C}_k(G_{m_k})$ is at least $k+\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{k\log k}$, as required by Theorem 2.1, whereas the condition of its average degree being at most $k+o(k)$ can be easily verified by noting that $\tilde{c}_k \le c_{k+1}$ for large k, proved in [3]. It is easy to prove that a.a.s. for all $k\ge 3$, $\mathcal{C}_k(G_{m_k})$ cannot have a subgraph with at most $\epsilon_0|\mathcal{C}_k|$ vertices and with average degree at least k, for some small fixed $\epsilon_0>0$ (by applying Lemma 5.1 in Section 5). Then using Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 and by Lemma 2.5, we can prove the following theorem for the size of k-regular subgraphs of $\mathcal{G}_{m_k}$.

Theorem 2.6 *For all sufficiently large k, there exist $0<\sigma_k\le\epsilon_k$ such that $\epsilon_k\to 0$ as $k\to\infty$ and a.a.s. all k-regular subgraphs of G_{m_k} have size between $(1-\epsilon_k)|\mathcal{C}_k|$ and $(1-\sigma_k)|\mathcal{C}_k|$, where $\mathcal{C}_k=\mathcal{C}_k(G_{m_k})$.*

We also have the following result for $\mathcal{G}(n,p)$ and $\mathcal{G}(n,m)$.

Theorem 2.7 *Let $k\ge 3$. For every $c\ge c_k+n^{-1/3}$ and $c=k+o(k)$ (with respect to $k\to\infty$), there exist two constants $\epsilon_k\ge\sigma_k>0$ with $\epsilon_k\to 0$ as $k\to\infty$ such that a.a.s. all k-regular subgraphs of $\mathcal{G}(n,cn/2)$ (and $\mathcal{G}(n,c/n)$), if they exist, have size between $(1-\epsilon_k)|\mathcal{C}_k|$ and $(1-\sigma_k)|\mathcal{C}_k|$.*

3 Proof of Theorem 2.1

Let $\mathbf{Y}$ denote the degree sequence of $\mathcal{M}(n,M,k)$. It was proved in [4] that the distribution of $\mathbf{Y}$ is precisely the truncated multinomial $Multi(n,M,k)$, defined as follows. Let $\mathcal{D}_{n,M,k}$ denote the set of vectors

$$\left\{\mathbf{d}=(d_i)_{i=1}^n:\ \sum_{1\le i\le n} d_i=M,\quad d_i\ge k,\forall\ 1\le i\le n\right\}.$$

Then for any $\mathbf{d}\in\mathcal{D}_{n,M,k}$,

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{Y}=\mathbf{d})=\frac{\binom{M}{d_1,\ldots,d_n}/n^M}{\sum_{\mathbf{d}\in\mathcal{D}_{n,M,k}}\binom{M}{d_1,\ldots,d_n}/n^M}=\frac{\prod_{i=1}^n 1/d_i!}{\sum_{\mathbf{d}\in\mathcal{D}_{n,M,k}}\prod_{i=1}^n 1/d_i!}. \tag{3.1}$$

The distribution of $\mathbf{Y}$ can be approximated by n independent copies of a truncated Poisson random variable, defined as follows. Let $d=M/n$. Choose $\lambda>0$ such that $\lambda f_{k-1}(\lambda)=df_k(\lambda)$. It is easy to see that λ exists and is unique as long as $d>k$. Define $Z_{\ge k}(\lambda)$ to be the random variable with probability function

$$\mathbf{P}(Z_{\ge k}(\lambda)=j)=\frac{e^{-\lambda}\lambda^j}{f_k(\lambda)j!},\quad \forall j\ge k, \tag{3.2}$$

where $f_k(\lambda)$ is defined to be $\sum_{i\ge k}e^{-\lambda}\lambda^i/i!$.

The following result on approximating $\mathbf{Y}$ by independent copies of $Z_{\ge k}(\lambda)$ can be found in [6, Corollary 5.3].

Proposition 3.1 *Assume $d = M/n = O(1)$ and let λ be chosen such that $\lambda f_{k-1}(\lambda) = df_k(\lambda)$. Let A_n be a subset of $\mathcal{D}_{n,M,k}$. Let $\mathbf{P}_{TP}(An)$ denote the probability that $(Z_1, \dots, Z_n) \in A_n$ where Z_i are independent copies of $Z_{\geq k}(\lambda)$ defined in (3.2) and let $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(A_n)$ denote the probability that $(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) \in A_n$ in $\mathcal{M}(n, M, k)$. Assume that $M - kn \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. Then*

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(A_n) = O(\sqrt{M})\mathbf{P}_{TP}(A_n).$$

Given a degree sequence $\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{D}_{n,M,k}$, let $g(\mathbf{d})$ denote the number of simple graphs with degree sequence $\mathbf{d}$. In particular, let $g_k(n)$ denote the number of k-regular graphs on n vertices. The estimation of $g(\mathbf{d})$ was studied in a few research papers. See [8, 9, 10]. Here we cite the result by McKay [8]. Let $d_{\max} = \max\{d_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. Recall that $\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{D}_{n,M,k}$. So $\sum_{i=1}^n d_i = M$. If $d_{\max} = o(M^{1/4})$, we have the following asymptotic estimate.

$$g(\mathbf{d}) = \frac{M!}{2^{M/2}(M/2)! \prod_{i=1}^n d_i!} \exp\left(-\varphi(\mathbf{d})\right), \tag{3.3}$$

where

$$\varphi(\mathbf{d}) = \sum_{i=1}^n d_i(d_i - 1)/2M + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n d_i(d_i - 1)/2M\right)^2 + O(d_{\max}^4/M). \tag{3.4}$$

The proof uses the configuration model, first introduced by Bollobás [1]. Consider each vertex i as a bin containing d_i points. Uniformly take a random matching of all M points and represent each pair in the matching as an edge in the resulting (multi)graph. Then the total number of matchings is $M!/2^{M/2}(M/2)!$. The resulting (random) graph is not necessarily simple. But it is easy to see that every simple graph corresponds to exactly $\prod_{i=1}^n d_i!$ distinct matchings. Hence, the above estimate was obtained by proving that the probability that the resulting graph is simple is $\exp\left(-\varphi(\mathbf{d})\right)$, which holds when $d_{\max} = o(M^{1/4})$. Of course, if we ignore the probability of the resulting graph being simple, we have the following coarse upper bound of $g(\mathbf{d})$

$$g(\mathbf{d}) \leq \frac{M!}{2^{M/2}(M/2)! \prod_{i=1}^n d_i!}, \tag{3.5}$$

which holds for any degree sequence $\mathbf{d}$.

Let $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\cdot)$ and $\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(\cdot)$ denote the probability and expectation in the probability space $\mathcal{M}(n, M, k)$ and let $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{H}}(\cdot)$ and $\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}(\cdot)$ denote the probability and expectation in $\mathcal{H}(n, M, k)$. Let $G \sim \mathcal{M}(n, M, k)$. Then, for any event A and any random variable X,

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{H}}(A) = \frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(A \wedge (G \textit{ simple}))}{\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(G \textit{ simple})}, \quad \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}(X) = \frac{\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(XI\{G \textit{ simple}\})}{\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(G \textit{ simple})},$$

as $\mathcal{H}(n, M, k)$ is $\mathcal{M}(n, M, k)$ restricted to simple graphs. The following proposition is a standard method of proving a.a.s. properties in $\mathcal{H}(n, M, k)$. Instead of proving that some property holds a.a.s. in $\mathcal{H}(n, M, k)$ directly, it is usually easier to prove that it holds a.a.s. in $\mathcal{M}(n, M, k)$ instead. This proposition can be found in many papers (e.g. [6]). (In fact, it can be easily deduced from (3.3) and Lemma 3.3 below.)

Proposition 3.2 *Assume $M = O(n)$. Then $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(G \textit{ simple}) = \Omega(1)$, where $G \sim \mathcal{M}(n, M, k)$.*

Let λ be such that $\lambda f_{k-1}(\lambda) = df_k(\lambda)$, where $d = M/n$. Define

$$\zeta = \lambda^2 f_{k-2}(\lambda)/2df_k(\lambda). \tag{3.6}$$

Define $\mathcal{D}^0_{n,M,k}$ to be the subset of $\mathcal{D}_{n,M,k}$ satisfying

$$d_{\max} \le M^{1/4}/\log n, \quad \zeta - 1/\log n \le \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i(d_i-1)/2M \le \zeta + 1/\log n. \tag{3.7}$$

Lemma 3.3 *Assume $M = O(n)$. Then $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{Y} \notin \mathcal{D}^0_{n,M,k}) = o(1)$.*

Proof. Let $Z_1, \ldots, Z_n$ be independent copies of $Z_{\ge k}(\lambda)$, where $\lambda f_{k-1}(\lambda) = df_k(\lambda)$ and $d = M/n$. Then $\mathbf{E}Z_i = \lambda^2 f_{k-2}(\lambda)/f_k(\lambda)$. First we bound the probability

$$\mathbf{P}\Big(\max_{1\le i\le n} Z_i \ge M^{1/4}/\log n\Big).$$

By the definition of $Z_{\ge k}(\lambda)$ in (3.2), we immediately have

$$\mathbf{P}\Big(\max_{1\le i\le n} Z_i \ge t\Big) \le \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{P}(Z_i \ge t) = O(ne^{-\lambda}\lambda^t/f_k(\lambda)t!) = O(n(e\lambda/t)^t) = O(e^{-t}), \tag{3.8}$$

where $t = M^{1/4}/\log n$. Next, we bound the probability that

$$\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n} Z_i(Z_i-1)/2M - \zeta\right| > 1/\log n.$$

Let $W_i = Z_i I\{Z_i \le \log n\}$. Then for every $1 \le i \le n$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}(Z_i \ne W_i) &= \mathbf{P}(Z_i > \log n) = O(e^{-\lambda}\lambda^{\log n}/(\log n)!) < \exp(-\lambda + \log n \log(e\lambda/\log n)) \\ &< \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\log n \log\log n\right) = n^{-\log\log n/2}.\end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\mathbf{E}W_i(W_i-1) = \lambda^2 f_{k-1}(\lambda)/f_k(\lambda) = 2d\zeta.$$

By Hoeffding's inequality and noting that $M = dn$ and $|W_i| \le \log n$ for all i, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbf{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n} W_i(W_i-1)/2M - \zeta\right| > \frac{1}{\log n}\right) = \mathbf{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n}\Big(W_i(W_i-1) - \mathbf{E}W_i(W_i-1)\Big)\right| > \frac{2M}{\log n}\right) \\ &\le 2\exp\left(-\frac{2(2M/\log n)^2}{(\log n)^2 n}\right) = 2\exp\left(-\frac{8d^2n}{(\log n)^4}\right)\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbf{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n} Z_i(Z_i-1)/2M - \zeta\right| > \frac{1}{\log n}\right) \le \mathbf{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n} W_i(W_i-1)/2M - \zeta\right| > \frac{1}{\log n}\right) + n\mathbf{P}(Z_1 \ne W_1) \\ &\le 2\exp\left(-\frac{8d^2n}{(\log n)^4}\right) + n^{1-\log\log n/2} = o(1/M).\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by Proposition 3.1, $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{Y} \notin \mathcal{D}^0_{n,M,k}) = o(1)$. ∎

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be a small constant and let B_ϵ denote the event that there is a k-regular subgraph whose size is between ϵn and $(1-\epsilon)n$. Given a set S, let A_S denote the event that there is a k-regular subgraph on S. Then by Proposition 3.2 and Lemma 3.3 and by symmetry,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{H}}(B_\epsilon) &\le \frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(B_\epsilon \wedge (G\ simple) \wedge \mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{D}^0_{n,M,k}) + \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{Y} \notin \mathcal{D}^0_{n,M,k})}{\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(G\ simple)} \\
&= O(\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(B_\epsilon \wedge (G\ simple) \wedge \mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{D}^0_{n,M,k})) + o(1) \\
&= O\left(\sum_{\epsilon n \le s \le (1-\epsilon)n} \sum_{S \subseteq [n]:\ |S|=s} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(A_S \wedge (G\ simple) \wedge \mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{D}^0_{n,M,k}) \right) + o(1) \\
&= O\left(\sum_{\epsilon n \le s \le (1-\epsilon)n} \binom{n}{s} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(A_{[s]} \wedge (G\ simple) \wedge \mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{D}^0_{n,M,k}) \right) + o(1). \qquad (3.9)
\end{aligned}$$

Let $X_{[s]}$ denote the number of k-regular subgraphs on $S = [s]$. For an arbitrary subset $\mathcal{D}$ of $\mathcal{D}^0_{n,M,k}$, let $\overline{\mathcal{D}} = \mathcal{D}^0_{n,M,k} \setminus \mathcal{D}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(A_{[s]} \wedge (G\ simple) \wedge \mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{D}^0_{n,M,k}) = \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(A_{[s]} \wedge (G\ simple) \wedge \mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{D}) + O(\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\overline{\mathcal{D}})) \\
&\quad \le \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(X_{[s]} I\{(G\ simple) \wedge \mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{D}\}) + O(\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\overline{\mathcal{D}})) \\
&\quad = \sum_{\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{M}}(X_{[s]} \mid (G\ simple) \wedge \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{d}) \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(G\ simple \mid \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{d}) \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{d}) + O(\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\overline{\mathcal{D}})) \\
&\quad \le \sum_{\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}(X_{[s]} \mid \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{d}) \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{d}) + O(\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\overline{\mathcal{D}})) \\
&\quad \le \sum_{\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{D}} g_k(s) \frac{g(\mathbf{d}')}{g(\mathbf{d})} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{d}) + O(\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\overline{\mathcal{D}})), \qquad (3.10)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{d}' = (d'_i)_{i=1}^n$ is defined by $d'_i = d_i I\{i > s\} + (d_i - k) I\{i \le s\}$ for all $1 \le i \le n$. Note that the last inequality above holds because the number of k-regular graphs on S is $g_k(s)$, whereas the probability that a given k-regular graph on S is a k-regular subgraph of $\mathcal{H}(n, M, k)$ on S, conditional on the degree sequence of $\mathcal{H}(n, M, k)$ being $\mathbf{d}$, is at most $g(\mathbf{d}')/g(\mathbf{d})$.

In what follows, we will choose appropriate $\mathcal{D}$ so that $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\overline{\mathcal{D}})$ is sufficiently small and we will upper bound

$$\sum_{\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{D}} g_k(s) \frac{g(\mathbf{d}')}{g(\mathbf{d})} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{d}). \qquad (3.11)$$

Let $M_s \ge ks$ and let $\mathcal{M}(n, M, M_s, k)$ denote the probability space of $\mathcal{M}(n, M, k)$ conditioned to $\sum_{i \le s} Y_i = M_s$. Then the distribution of the degree sequence $Y_1 \ldots, Y_s$ is precisely truncated multinomial $Multi(s, M_s, k)$. Let

$$\mathcal{D}_{n,M,M_s,k} = \left\{ \mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{D}^0_{n,M,k} :\ \sum_{i \le s} d_i = M_s \right\}.$$

Let $\sigma > 0$ be fixed. Define

$$\mathcal{D}_\sigma = \bigcup_{ks \le M_s \le (1+\sigma)ds} \mathcal{D}_{n,M,M_s,k}.$$

We will estimate (3.11) and $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\overline{\mathcal{D}})$ with $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_\sigma$. First we upper bound $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\overline{\mathcal{D}}_\sigma)$.

Lemma 3.4 *Assume $d \ge k + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{k \log k}$ and $d = k + o(k)$, where the asymptotics refers to $k \to \infty$. Take μ that satisfies $\mu f_{k-1}(\mu) = d f_k(\mu)$. Then $k \le \mu = k + o(k)$ for all large k and $\mu/d \to 1$, as $k \to \infty$.*

Proof. Let $\widehat{\mu} = k$. Then $f_k(\widehat{\mu}) \ge 1/2$. Hence, for all large k,

$$\frac{\widehat{\mu} f_{k-1}(\widehat{\mu})}{f_k(\widehat{\mu})} = \widehat{\mu}\left(1 + \frac{e^{-\widehat{\mu}}\widehat{\mu}^{k-1}}{(k-1)! f_k(\widehat{\mu})}\right) \le k + C\sqrt{k} \le d,$$

for some positive constant C, by Stirling's approximation. It is easy to check that $x f_{k-1}(x)/f_k(x)$ is an increasing function of x and so we have that $\mu > \widehat{\mu} = k$. It is also obvious that $\mu = d f_k(\mu)/f_{k-1}(\mu) \le d = k + o(k)$. So $\mu/d \to 1$ as $k \to \infty$.

For a set S of vertices, let $deg(S)$ denote the sum of degrees of vertices in S. The following lemma is a standard concentration result on the degree sum of a set of vertices that is not too small. See [6, Corollary 5.4] for a detailed proof.

Lemma 3.5 *Let $G \sim \mathcal{M}(n, M, k)$ where $M = O(n)$ and $d = M/n \ge k$. Take μ that satisfies $\mu f_{k-1}(\mu) = d f_k(\mu)$. Assume $\mu/d \to 1$ as $k \to \infty$. Then for every $\sigma > 0$, there exists $K > 0$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$ such that for all $k > K$, and for any $S \subset [n]$ with $|S| \ge \log^2 n$,*

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(|deg(S) - d|S|| > \sigma d|S|) = \alpha^{d|S|}.$$

By Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5, for any fixed $\sigma > 0$, we have

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\overline{\mathcal{D}}_\sigma) \le \beta^{ds}, \quad \text{for some } 0 < \beta < 1. \tag{3.12}$$

Next, we estimate (3.11). Note that for every $\sigma > 0$, we have $1 + \sigma \ge k/d$, as $d \ge k$. Thus, $\mathcal{D}_\sigma$ is non-empty. We will prove the following lemma.

Lemma 3.6 *Let $G \sim \mathcal{M}(n, M, k)$ where $M = O(n)$ and $d = M/n > k$. Let $\sigma > 0$ be fixed and let $\eta = M/ks$. Define*

$$f(\eta, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\eta - 1}} (1 - 1/\eta)^{\eta/2} \left(\frac{e^{-\mu}}{f_k(\mu)}\right)^{1/k} \mu^{(1+\sigma)d/k} \frac{e^{(1+\sigma)d/k-1}}{((1+\sigma)d - k)^{(1+\sigma)d/k-1}}, \tag{3.13}$$

where μ is the root of

$$\mu f_{k-1}(\mu) = d f_k(\mu).$$

Then there is a positive constant C such that for every $\sigma > 0$, and for every $\epsilon n \le s \le (1-\epsilon)n$,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{D}_\sigma} g_k(s) \frac{g(\mathbf{d}')}{g(\mathbf{d})} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{d}) \le 2dsM\Big(\big(1 + C\sigma\big) f(\eta, \sigma)\Big)^{ks}.$$

We leave Lemma 3.6 to be proved in Section 3.1. In this section, we complete the proof of Theorem 2.1 using Lemma 3.6.

Let $\delta = s/n$. By (3.10) and Lemma 3.6, for any fixed $\sigma > 0$,

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}\Big(A_{[s]} \wedge (G \textit{ simple}) \wedge \mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{D}^0_{n,M,k}\Big) \le 2dsM\Big((1+C\sigma)f(d/k\delta, 1+\sigma)\Big)^{ks} + O(\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\overline{\mathcal{D}}_\sigma)).$$

Since $\binom{n}{s} \le n(\delta^{-\delta}(1-\delta)^{-1+\delta})^n$, by (3.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{H}}(B_\epsilon) &= O\left(\sum_{\epsilon n \le s \le (1-\epsilon)n} 2dsMn\Big(\delta^{-1/k}(1-\delta)^{-\frac{1-\delta}{k\delta}}(1+C\sigma)f(d/k\delta,\sigma)\Big)^{ks}\right) \\ &+ O\left(\sum_{\epsilon n \le s \le (1-\epsilon)n} \binom{n}{s}\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\overline{\mathcal{D}}_\sigma)\right) + o(1). \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

Lemma 3.7 *Assume $d \ge k + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{k\log k}$. For every $\epsilon > 0$ and every $\sigma > 0$, there exists a $K > 0$ such that for all $k > K$,*

$$\sum_{\epsilon n \le s \le (1-\epsilon)n} \binom{n}{s}\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\overline{\mathcal{D}}_\sigma) = o(1).$$

Proof. By (3.12), there exists $0 < \beta < 1$ depending only on σ that

$$\sum_{\epsilon n \le s \le (1-\epsilon)n} \binom{n}{s}\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\overline{\mathcal{D}}_\sigma) \le \sum_{\epsilon n \le s \le (1-\epsilon)n} \binom{n}{s}\beta^{ds} \le \sum_{s \ge \epsilon n}\left(\frac{en\beta^d}{s}\right)^s \le \sum_{s\ge\epsilon n}\left(\frac{e\beta^d}{\epsilon}\right)^s.$$

Choose K sufficiently large so that $e\beta^d/\epsilon < 1$. Then the above summation is $o(1)$. ∎

Recall the definition of f in (3.13), where μ is the root of $\mu f_{k-1}(\mu) = df_k(\mu)$.

Lemma 3.8 *Assume $d \ge k + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{k\log k}$ and $d = k + o(k)$, where the asymptotics refers to $k \to \infty$. Then for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exist sufficiently large $K > 0$ and sufficiently small $\sigma > 0$ such that for all $k > K$ and for all $\epsilon \le \delta \le 1-\epsilon$, $\delta^{-1/k}(1-\delta)^{-\frac{1-\delta}{k\delta}}(1+C\sigma)f(\eta,\sigma) < 1$, where $\eta = d/k\delta$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.4, $\mu \ge k$ and so $f_k(\mu) \ge 1/2$. Then, clearly, as $k \to \infty$,

$$\delta^{-1/k}(1-\delta)^{-\frac{1-\delta}{k\delta}} \to 1, \quad \frac{e^{1/k}}{k!^{1/k}} = (1+o(1))e/k, \quad \frac{\mu}{k} \to 1, \quad f_k(\mu)^{1/k} \to 1.$$

Define $g(\eta,\sigma) = \delta^{-1/k}(1-\delta)^{-\frac{1-\delta}{k\delta}}(1+C\sigma)f(\eta,\sigma)$. (Note $\delta = d/k\eta$ depends only on η.) Then, as $k \to \infty$ and $\sigma \to 0$,

$$g(\eta,\sigma) \to (\eta-1)^{\eta/2-1/2}\eta^{-\eta/2}e^{-\mu/k+(1+\sigma)d/k}\left(\frac{\mu}{(1+\sigma)d-k}\right)^{(1+\sigma)d/k-1}.$$

Next, we show that

$$e^{-\mu/k+(1+\sigma)d/k}\left(\frac{\mu}{(1+\sigma)d-k}\right)^{(1+\sigma)d/k-1}\to 1,$$

as $k\to\infty$ and $\sigma\to 0$. Let $x_\mu=\mu-k$ and $x_d=d-k$. Then, $x_\mu=o(k)$ and $x_d=o(k)$ by the assumption that $d=k+o(k)$ and Lemma 3.4. So,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\mu/k+(1+\sigma)d/k}\left(\frac{\mu}{(1+\sigma)d-k}\right)^{(1+\sigma)d/k-1} &= e^{(x_d-x_\mu)/k+\sigma(1+x_d/k)}\left(\frac{k+x_\mu}{x_d+\sigma(k+x_d)}\right)^{x_d/k+\sigma(1+x_d/k)}\\ &= \exp\Big((1+o(1))\sigma\Big)\left(\frac{k+x_\mu}{x_d+\sigma(k+x_d)}\right)^{x_d/k+\sigma(1+x_d/k)}\\ &= \exp\Big((1+o(1))\sigma\Big)\exp\left(\Big(\frac{x_d}{k}+\sigma(1+x_d/k)\Big)\log\left(\frac{1+x_\mu/k}{x_d/k+\sigma(1+x_d/k)}\right)\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the asymptotics above refers to $k\to\infty$. Since $x_\mu/k\to 0$ and $x_d/k+\sigma(1+x_d/k)\to 0$, as $k\to\infty$ and $\sigma\to 0$, the above can be arbitrarily small by choosing sufficiently large k and sufficiently small σ. Hence, $g(\eta,\sigma)\to(\eta-1)^{\eta/2-1/2}\eta^{-\eta/2}$. It is easy to prove that $(\eta-1)^{\eta/2-1/2}\eta^{-\eta/2}$ is a strictly decreasing function on $\eta>1$ with limit 1 as η approaches to 1 from above. Since $d>k$ and $\delta\le 1-\epsilon$, we have $\eta=d/k\delta\ge 1/(1-\epsilon)$. Thus, there exists $\epsilon'>0$, such that $(\eta-1)^{\eta/2-1/2}\eta^{-\eta/2}<1-\epsilon'$ and so $g(\eta,\sigma)<1$ by choosing sufficiently small σ and sufficiently large k (so that x_d/k and x_μ/k are sufficiently small). Therefore, for any $\epsilon>0$, there exist sufficiently large $K>0$ and sufficiently small $\sigma>0$, such that for all $k>K$, $\delta^{-1/k}(1-\delta)^{-\frac{1-\delta}{k\delta}}(1+C\sigma)f(\eta,\sigma)<1$ for all $\epsilon\le\delta\le 1-\epsilon$. ∎

Now we complete the proof of Theorem 2.1. By Lemma 3.8, for every $\epsilon>0$, there exists $\sigma>0$, such that provided k is sufficiently large,

$$\sum_{\epsilon n\le s\le(1-\epsilon)n}2dsMn\Big(\delta^{-1/k}(1-\delta)^{-\frac{1-\delta}{k\delta}}(1+C\sigma)f(\eta)\Big)^{ks}<\sum_{\epsilon n\le s\le(1-\epsilon)n}\beta^{ks}=o(1),$$

for some $0<\beta<1$. Let $\sigma>0$ be chosen so that the above holds. Then by Lemma 3.7, provided k is sufficiently large, $\sum_{\epsilon n\le s\le(1-\epsilon)n}\binom{n}{s}\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\overline{\mathcal{D}}_\sigma)=o(1)$. By (3.14), $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{H}}(B_\epsilon)=o(1)$ and so a.a.s. there is no k-regular subgraph in $\mathcal{H}(n,M,k)$ with size between ϵn and $(1-\epsilon)n$.

3.1 Proof of Lemma 3.6

Recall that for any $\mathbf{d}\in\mathcal{D}_{n,M,M_s,k}$, $\mathbf{d}'$ is defined as $d_i'=d_iI\{i>s\}+(d_i-k)I\{i\le s\}$. By (3.5) and (3.3),

$$\begin{aligned} g_k(s) &\le \frac{(ks)!}{2^{ks/2}(ks/2)!k!^s},\\ g(\mathbf{d}) &= \frac{M!}{2^{M/2}(M/2)!\prod_{i=1}^n d_i!}\exp(-\varphi(\mathbf{d})+o(d_{\max}^4/M)),\\ g(\mathbf{d}') &\le \frac{(M-ks)!}{2^{(M-ks)/2}((M-ks)/2)!\prod_{i=1}^n(d_i-k)!}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\varphi(\mathbf{d})$ is defined in (3.17). By the definition of $\mathcal{D}^0_{n,M,k}$ in (3.7), and the definition of ζ in (3.6), for any $\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{D}_{n,M,M_s,k} \subseteq \mathcal{D}^0_{n,M,k}$, we have

$$\varphi(\mathbf{d}) = \zeta + \zeta^2 + o(1).$$

Then for some constant $C > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\mathbf{d}\in\mathcal{D}_\sigma} g_k(s)\frac{g(\mathbf{d}')}{g(\mathbf{d})}\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{Y}=\mathbf{d}) &= \sum_{M_s=ks}^{(1+\sigma)ds} \sum_{\mathbf{d}\in\mathcal{D}_{n,M,M_s,k}} g_k(s)\frac{g(\mathbf{d}')}{g(\mathbf{d})}\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{Y}=\mathbf{d}) \\
&\le \frac{(ks)!\exp(\zeta+\zeta^2+o(1))}{2^{ks/2}(ks/2)!k!^s}\frac{2^{M/2}(M/2)!(M-ks)!}{M!2^{(M-ks)/2}((M-ks)/2)!}\sum_{M_s=ks}^{(1+\sigma)ds} \sum_{\mathbf{d}\in\mathcal{D}_{n,M,M_s,k}} \prod_{1\le i\le s}[d_i]_k\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{Y}=\mathbf{d}) \\
&\le C\left(\frac{ks}{M-ks}\right)^{ks/2}\frac{1}{k!^s}\left(1-\frac{ks}{M}\right)^{M/2}\sum_{M_s=ks}^{(1+\sigma)ds} \sum_{\mathbf{d}\in\mathcal{D}_{s,M_s,k}} \prod_{1\le i\le s}[d_i]_k\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\widetilde{\mathbf{Y}}=\mathbf{d}),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

where $\widetilde{\mathbf{Y}} = (Y_1, \ldots, Y_s)$ is the sub-degree sequence of $\mathcal{M}(n, M, k)$. Since the distribution of $\widetilde{\mathbf{Y}}$ is $Multi(s, M_s, k)$, by (3.1),

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\mathbf{d}\in\mathcal{D}_{s,M_s,k}} \prod_{1\le i\le s}[d_i]_k\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\widetilde{\mathbf{Y}}=\mathbf{d}) &= \sum_{\mathbf{d}\in\mathcal{D}_{s,M_s,k}} \frac{\prod_{i\le s}[d_i]_k\prod_{i=1}^s 1/d_i!}{\sum_{\mathbf{d}\in\mathcal{D}_{s,M_s,k}}\prod_{i=1}^s 1/d_i!} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sum_{\mathbf{d}\in\mathcal{D}_{s,M_s,k}}\prod_{i=1}^s 1/d_i!}\sum_{\mathbf{d}\in\mathcal{D}_{s,M_s,k}}\prod_{i=1}^s\frac{1}{(d_i-k)!}.
\end{aligned}$$

Obviously, for every $M_s \ge ks$, $\prod_{i=1}^s 1/d_i!$ for $\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{D}_{s,M_s,k}$ is minimized when $\mathbf{d} = (k, k, \ldots, k, k+\phi)$, where $\phi = M_s - ks$. Thus, we immediately have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.9 *For every $M_s \ge ks$,*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{d}\in\mathcal{D}_{s,M_s,k}}\prod_{i=1}^s\frac{1}{d_i!} \ge k!^{-s+1}(k+\phi)!^{-1} = k!^{-s}\frac{k!}{(k+\phi)!} \ge \frac{k!^{-s}}{(k+\phi)^\phi},$$

where $\phi = M_s - ks$.

When $M_s - ks \to \infty$, we have a fairly precise estimate of $\sum_{\mathbf{d}\in\mathcal{D}_{s,M_s,k}}\prod_{i=1}^s 1/d_i!$, stated in the following lemma.

Lemma 3.10 *Suppose $M_s - ks \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. Then*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{d}\in\mathcal{D}_{s,M_s,k}}\prod_{i=1}^s 1/d_i! = \Theta\Big(1/\sqrt{M_s}\Big)e^{\mu s}\mu^{-M_s}f_k(\mu)^s,$$

where μ satisfies

$$\frac{\mu f_{k-1}(\mu)}{f_k(\mu)} = \frac{M_s}{s}.$$

Proof. Let Z_i, $i \le s$ be independent copies of the truncated Poisson variables $Z_{\ge k}(\mu)$, defined in (3.2). Then,

$$\mathbf{P}\Big(\sum_{i\le s} Z_i = M_s\Big) = \sum_{\mathbf{d}\in\mathcal{D}_{s,M_s,k}} \prod_{i\le s} \frac{e^{-\mu}\mu^{d_i}}{f_k(\mu)d_i!} = \frac{e^{-\mu s}\mu^{M_s}}{f_k(\mu)^s} \sum_{\mathbf{d}\in\mathcal{D}_{s,M_s,k}} \prod_{i\le s} \frac{1}{d_i!}.$$

By the definition of μ, $\mathbf{P}\big(\sum_{i\le s} Z_i = M_s\big) = \Theta\big(1/\sqrt{M_s}\big)$ by [13, Theorem 4(a)]. Hence,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{d}\in\mathcal{D}_{s,M_s,k}} \prod_{i\le s} \frac{1}{d_i!} = \Theta\Big(1/\sqrt{M_s}\Big) e^{\mu s}\mu^{-M_s} f_k(\mu)^s. \quad \blacksquare$$

In the next lemma we deduce an upper bound of $\sum_{\mathbf{d}\in\mathcal{D}_{s,M_s,k}} \prod_{i=1}^s 1/(d_i-k)!$.

Lemma 3.11 *For every* $M_s \ge ks$,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{d}\in\mathcal{D}_{s,M_s,k}} \prod_{i=1}^s \frac{1}{(d_i-k)!} \le \frac{e^{M_s-ks}}{(M_s/s-k)^{M_s-ks}}.$$

Proof. We have that

$$\sum_{\mathbf{d}\in\mathcal{D}_{s,M_s,k}} \prod_{i=1}^s \frac{1}{(d_i-k)!} = \sum_{\mathbf{d}\in\mathcal{D}_{s,M_s-ks,0}} \prod_{i=1}^s \frac{1}{d_i!}.$$

If $M_s = ks$, the inequality holds trivially as both sides equals 1 (by defining $0^0 = 1$). Suppose $M_s > ks$. Let Z_i, $i \le s$ be independent copies of the Poisson variable $\mathbf{Po}(\lambda)$, where $\lambda = M_s/s - k$. Then

$$\mathbf{P}\Big(\sum Z_i = M_s - ks\Big) = \sum_{\mathbf{d}\in\mathcal{D}_{s,M_s-ks,0}} \prod_{i\le s} \frac{e^{-\lambda}\lambda^{d_i}}{d_i!} = e^{-M_s+ks}\lambda^{M_s-ks} \sum_{\mathbf{d}\in\mathcal{D}_{s,M_s-ks,0}} \prod_{i\le s} \frac{1}{d_i!}.$$

Since $\mathbf{P}\big(\sum Z_i = M_s - ks\big) \le 1$, we have

$$\sum_{\mathbf{d}\in\mathcal{D}_{s,M_s-ks,0}} \prod_{i\le s} \frac{1}{d_i!} \le \frac{e^{M_s-ks}}{\lambda^{M_s-ks}}. \quad \blacksquare$$

By Lemmas 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11 and (3.15) and using Stirling's formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mathbf{d}\in\mathcal{D}_\sigma} g_k(s)\frac{g(\mathbf{d}')}{g(\mathbf{d})}\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{Y}=\mathbf{d}) \quad &\le \quad \phi + \sum_{M_s=ks+\log n}^{(1+\sigma)ds} M\left(\frac{ks}{M-ks}\right)^{ks/2} \frac{1}{k!^s}\left(1-\frac{ks}{M}\right)^{M/2} \\ &\quad \times \left(\frac{e^{-\overline{\mu}}}{f_k(\overline{\mu})}\right)^s \overline{\mu}^{M_s} \frac{e^{M_s-ks}}{(M_s/s-k)^{M_s-ks}}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

where $\overline{\mu}$ satisfies

$$\frac{\overline{\mu} f_{k-1}(\overline{\mu})}{f_k(\overline{\mu})} = \frac{M_s}{s},$$

and

$$\phi \;=\; (\log n)M\left(\frac{ks}{M-ks}\right)^{ks/2}\frac{1}{k!^s}\left(1-\frac{ks}{M}\right)^{M/2}k!^s(k+\log n)^{\log n}\frac{e^{M_s-ks}}{(M_s/s-k)^{M_s-ks}}.$$

Note that ϕ corresponds to the contribution to the summation (3.16) from $ks \le M_s < ks+\log n$.

Lemma 3.12 *Let $\rho > k$ and let $\mu = \mu(\rho)$ be the root of $\mu f_{k-1}(\mu)/f_k(\mu) = \rho$. Then $\mu > \rho - k$ for all $\rho > k$.*

Proof. Let $\widehat{\mu} = \rho - k > 0$. Since $f_k(\widehat{\mu}) > e^{-\widehat{\mu}}\widehat{\mu}^k/k!$, we have

$$\frac{\widehat{\mu}f_{k-1}(\widehat{\mu})}{f_k(\widehat{\mu})} \;=\; \widehat{\mu} + \frac{\widehat{\mu}e^{-\widehat{\mu}}\widehat{\mu}^{k-1}}{(k-1)!f_k(\widehat{\mu})} = \widehat{\mu} + \frac{ke^{-\widehat{\mu}}\widehat{\mu}^k}{k!f_k(\widehat{\mu})} < \widehat{\mu} + k = \rho.$$

Since $\mu f_{k-1}(\mu)/f_k(\mu)$ is an increasing function of μ, we have $\mu > \widehat{\mu} = \rho - k$. This completes the proof of the lemma. ∎

Lemma 3.13 *Let $\mu = \mu(\rho)$ be the root of $\mu f_{k-1}(\mu)/f_k(\mu) = \rho$, for $\rho > k$. Then*

$$\mu^\rho \frac{e^{-\mu}}{f_k(\mu)}\left(\frac{e}{\rho-k}\right)^{\rho-k}$$

is an increasing function on $\rho > k$.

Proof. Define $g(x) = xf_{k-1}(x)/f_k(x)$. Then $g(x)$ is an increasing function on $x > 0$ and $g(x) \to k$ as $x \to 0$. Let $h_1(\rho) = \rho\log\mu - \mu - \log f_k(\mu)$. Then

$$\mu^\rho\frac{e^{-\mu}}{f_k(\mu)} = \exp(h_1(\rho)). \tag{3.17}$$

Taking the derivative of h_1 with respect to ρ, we have

$$h_1'(\rho) = \log\mu + \frac{\rho}{\mu}\mu'(\rho) - \mu'(\rho) - \frac{f_k'(\mu)}{f_k(\mu)}\mu'(\rho) = \log\mu + \mu'(\rho)\left(\frac{\rho}{\mu} - 1 - \frac{f_k'(\mu)}{f_k(\mu)}\right).$$

Since $f_k'(\mu) = f_{k-1}(\mu) - f_k(\mu)$ for all $k \ge 1$, we have

$$h_1'(\rho) = \log\mu + \mu'(\rho)\left(\frac{\rho}{\mu} - \frac{f_{k-1}(\mu)}{f_k(\mu)}\right).$$

Since $\rho = g(\mu)$, we have $\rho/\mu = f_{k-1}(\mu)/f_k(\mu)$, which implies that $h_1'(\rho) = \log\mu$.

On the other hand,

$$\left(\frac{e}{\rho-k}\right)^{\rho-k} = \exp\Big((\rho-k)\big(1-\log(\rho-k)\big)\Big).$$

Let $h_2(\rho) = (\rho - k)(1 - \log(\rho - k))$. Then the derivative of h_2 is $-\log(\rho - k)$.

Thus, $\mu^\rho \frac{e^{-\mu}}{f_k(\mu)} \left(\frac{e}{\rho-k}\right)^{\rho-k} = \exp(h_1(\rho) + h_2(\rho))$, and

$$h_1'(\rho) + h_2'(\rho) = \log \mu - \log(\rho - k) = \log\left(\frac{\mu}{\rho - k}\right).$$

By Lemma 3.12, the above is greater than 0 for all $\rho > k$. Hence, $\mu^\rho \frac{e^{-\mu}}{f_k(\mu)} \left(\frac{e}{\rho-k}\right)^{\rho-k}$ is an increasing function of ρ on $\rho > k$. ∎

In $\mathcal{D}_\sigma$, we have $ks \le M_s \le (1+\sigma)ds$. By Lemma 3.13,

$$\left(\frac{e^{-\overline{\mu}}}{f_k(\overline{\mu})}\right)^s \overline{\mu}^{M_s} \frac{e^{M_s - ks}}{(M_s/s - k)^{M_s - ks}} = \left(\mu^\rho \frac{e^{-\overline{\mu}}}{f_k(\overline{\mu})} \left(\frac{e}{\rho - k}\right)^{\rho - k}\right)^s,$$

in (3.16) (taking $\rho = M_s/s$) is maximized at $M_s = (1+\sigma)ds$. Let $\eta = M/ks$. Define

$$\widehat{f}(\eta, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\eta - 1}} (1 - 1/\eta)^{\eta/2} \frac{1}{k!^{1/k}} \left(\frac{e^{-\widehat{\mu}}}{f_k(\widehat{\mu})}\right)^{1/k} \widehat{\mu}^{(1+\sigma)d/k} \frac{e^{(1+\sigma)d/k - 1}}{\big((1+\sigma)d - k\big)^{(1+\sigma)d/k - 1}},$$

where $\widehat{\mu}$ is the root of

$$\widehat{\mu} f_{k-1}(\widehat{\mu}) / f_k(\widehat{\mu}) = (1+\sigma)d.$$

Compare $\widehat{f}$ with f in (3.13). They are almost the same except that μ and $\widehat{\mu}$ are slightly different. By (3.15),

$$\sum_{\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{D}_\sigma} g_k(s) \frac{g(\mathbf{d}')}{g(\mathbf{d})} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{d}) \le \phi + \sum_{M_s = ks + \log n}^{(1+\sigma)ds} M \widehat{f}(\eta, \sigma)^{ks},$$

where ϕ is defined in (3.17).

Lemma 3.14 *Let μ be the root of $\mu f_{k-1}(\mu) = d f_k(\mu)$ and let f be defined as in (3.13). Then there is $C > 0$ such that for every $\sigma > 0$,*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{D}_\sigma} g_k(s) \frac{g(\mathbf{d}')}{g(\mathbf{d})} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{d}) \le 2dsM\Big(\big(1 + C\sigma\big) f(\eta, \sigma)\Big)^{ks}.$$

Proof. Comparing the terms in (3.17) with terms in (3.16), It is straightforward to verify that

$$k!^{1/k} (k + \log n)^{\log n / ks} \frac{e^{M_s/ks - 1}}{(M_s/s - k)^{M_s/ks - 1}} \le \left(\frac{e^{-\widehat{\mu}}}{f_k(\widehat{\mu})}\right)^{1/k} \widehat{\mu}^{(1+\sigma)d/k} \frac{e^{(1+\sigma)d/k - 1}}{\big((1+\sigma)d - k\big)^{(1+\sigma)d/k - 1}}$$

for every $ks \le M_s \le ks + \log n$ eventually as $s \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. Thus,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{D}_\sigma} g_k(s) \frac{g(\mathbf{d}')}{g(\mathbf{d})} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{d}) \le 2dsM \widehat{f}(\eta, \sigma)^{ks},$$

By the definition of $\widehat{f}$, we only need to show that $\widehat{f}(\eta,\sigma) = (1+O(\sigma))f(\eta,\sigma)$ for every $\sigma > 0$.It follows by noting that $\widehat{\mu} = (1+O(\sigma))\mu$, whereas $d/k = O(1)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\mu}^{(1+\sigma)d/k} &= (1+O(\sigma))\mu^{(1+\sigma)d/k} \\
\frac{e^{-\widehat{\mu}/k}}{f_k(\widehat{\mu})^{1/k}} &= (1+O(\sigma))\frac{e^{-\mu/k}}{f_k(\mu)^{1/k}}.
\end{aligned}$$

and the constant involved in the asymptotics above does not depend on σ. ∎

4 Proof of Theorem 2.2

Lemma 4.1 *Let $M = O(n)$ and $M \geq kn$. For every $k \geq 3$, a.a.s. there exists $\Omega(n)$ vertices in $\mathcal{H}(n,M,k)$ whose degree is at least $k+1$ and whose neighbours all have degree k.*

Proof. As $M = O(n)$, a.a.s. the numbers of vertices with degree k and $k+1$ are both $\Omega(n)$ by applying Proposition 3.1. I.e., there are positive constants $C_1 < C_2$ and $D_1 < D_2$ such that a.a.s.

$$C_1 n \leq N_k \leq C_2 n, \quad D_1 n \leq N_{k+1} \leq D_2 n, \tag{4.1}$$

where N_i denote the number of vertices with degree $i \in \{k, k+1\}$. Recall the definition of $\mathcal{D}^0_{n,M,k}$ in (3.7). Let $\mathcal{D}^1_{n,M,k}$ denote the subset of $\mathcal{D}^0_{n,M,k}$ such that $C_1 n \leq \sum_{i:d_i=k} 1 \leq C_2 n$ and $D_1 n \leq \sum_{i:d_i=k+1} 1 \leq D_2 n$. Let $\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{D}^1_{n,M,k}$. Conditional on the degree sequence of $\mathcal{H}(n,M,k)$ being $\mathbf{d}$, $\mathcal{H}(n,M,k)$ can be generated by the configuration model, as described below (3.17). Let $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{d}}$ denote the random (multi)graph generated by the configuration model. We prove that the claim in this lemma holds in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{d}}$ for every $\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{D}^1_{n,M,k}$. Then the lemma follows by (4.1) and Lemma 3.3 and the fact that the probability that $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{d}}$ is simple is $\Omega(1)$ (See [8]). Now consider $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{d}}$ where $\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{D}^1_{n,M,k}$. Let $n_k = \sum_{i:d_i=k} 1$ and $n_{k+1} = \sum_{i:d_i=k+1} 1$. Let X denote the number of vertices with degree $k+1$, whose neighbours all have degree k. There are n_{k+1} ways to choose a vertex v with degree $k+1$ and $\binom{n_k}{k+1}$ ways to choose $k+1$ vertices as neighbours of v. For each of these $k+1$ chosen vertices, there are k ways to choose a point inside the vertex. The number of ways to match those $k+1$ points to the $k+1$ points inside v is $(k+1)!$. Then,

$$\mathbf{E}X = n_{k+1}\binom{n_k}{k+1} k^{k+1}(k+1)! \prod_{i=0}^{k} \frac{1}{M-1-2i} = \Omega(n),$$

where $\prod_{i=0}^{k} \frac{1}{M-1-2i}$ is the probability that a given set of $k+1$ pairs occurs in the random matching over M points. Next, we compute $\mathbf{E}X(X-1)$, i.e. we count the expected number of ordered pairs of distinct vertices, both with degree $k+1$, and both with all neighbours having degree k. We first count such pairs (v_1, v_2) such that v_1 is not adjacent to v_2 and $N(v_1) \cap N(v_2) = \emptyset$, where $N(v)$ denotes the set of neighbours of v. There are $n_{k+1}(n_{k+1}-1)$ ways to choose (v_1, v_2) and $\binom{n_k}{k+1}\binom{n_k-k-1}{k+1}$ ways to choose the neighbours of v_1 and v_2. Hence, the expected number of such pairs is

$$n_{k+1}(n_{k+1}-1)\binom{n_k}{k+1}\binom{n_k-k-1}{k+1}k^{2(k+1)}(k+1)!^2\prod_{i=0}^{2k+1}\frac{1}{M-1-2i}=(1+o(1))(\mathbf{E}X)^2. \tag{4.2}$$

Next, we bound the number of such pairs (v_1, v_2) such that v_1 is adjacent to v_2. There are $n_{k+1}(n_{k+1}-1)$ ways to choose (v_1, v_2) and at most $\binom{n_k}{k}\binom{n_k}{k}$ ways to choose the neighbours of v_1 and v_2. Hence, the expected number of such pairs is at most

$$O\left(n_{k+1}^2 n_k^{2k}\prod_{i=0}^{2k}\frac{1}{M-1-2i}\right)=O(n). \tag{4.3}$$

Last, we bound the number of such pairs (v_1, v_2) such that v_1 is not adjacent to v_2 and $|N(v_1)\cap N(v_2)| = j$, $j \geq 1$. There are $\binom{n_k}{j}\binom{n_k-j}{k+1-j}\binom{n_k-k-1}{k+1-j} \leq n_k^{2k+2-j}$ to choose the neighbours of v_1 and v_2 and hence the expected number of such pairs is

$$O\left(n_{k+1}^2 n_k^{2k+2-j}\prod_{i=0}^{2k+1}\frac{1}{M-1-2i}\right)=O(n^{2-j})=O(n). \tag{4.4}$$

Combining (4.2), (4.3) and (4.4), we have $\mathbf{E}X(X-1) = (1+o(1))(\mathbf{E}X)^2$. It follows then that the variance of X is

$$\mathbf{E}X(X-1)+\mathbf{E}X-(\mathbf{E}X)^2=o((\mathbf{E}X)^2).$$

By the second moment method, it follows that a.a.s. $X = \Omega(n)$ and the claim of the lemma follows thereby. ∎

Proof of Theorem 2.2. Let $G \in \mathcal{H}(n, M, k)$. A vertex in G has property B if it has degree at least $k+1$ and all its neighbours have degree exactly k. If v has property B, then any k-regular subgraph H of G must miss at least one of its neighbour. By Lemma 4.1, a.a.s. there are $\Omega(n)$ vertices having property B. On the other hand, each vertex with degree k can be incident with at most k vertices that have property B. Hence, any k-regular subgraph of G must miss $\Omega(n)$ vertices of G. ∎

5 Proofs of Theorems 2.6 and 2.7

Lemma 5.1 *Let $k \geq 3$ and $\epsilon_0 = 1/4e$. Assume $p \leq 2k/n$. Then, a.a.s. all subgraphs of $\mathcal{G}(n,p)$ with size $s \leq \epsilon_0 n$ have less than $ks/2$ edges.*

Proof. Given s, let X_s denote the number of set S with $|S| = s$ that contains at least $ks/2$ edges. There are $\binom{n}{s}$ ways to choose a set of s vertices and given S with $|S| = s$, the probability that there are at least $ks/2$ edges inside S is at most

$$\binom{\binom{s}{2}}{ks/2}p^{ks/2}\leq\left(\frac{es^2p}{ks}\right)^{ks/2}\leq(2es/n)^{3s/2}.$$

Hence,

$$\mathbf{E}X_s \le \binom{n}{s} (2es/n)^{3s/2} = 2e^2 (2es/n)^{s/2}.$$

By the choice of ϵ_0, the expected number of sets S with $|S| \le \epsilon_0 n$ that contain at least $k|S|/2$ edges is at most

$$\sum_{s \le \log n} (O(s/n))^{s/2} + \sum_{\log n < s \le \epsilon_0 n} 2e^2 \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{s/2} = o(1).$$

The claim follows by the first moment method. ∎

Proof of Lemma 2.5. By the definition of μ_k, $h_k'(\mu_k) = 0$. Since

$$h_k'(x) = \frac{f_{k-1}(x) - x f_{k-1}'(x)}{f_{k-1}(x)^2},$$

and $f_k'(x) = f_{k-1}(x) - f_k(x)$ for all $k \ge 1$, we have

$$f_{k-1}(\mu_k) = \mu_k (f_{k-2}(\mu_k) - f_{k-1}(\mu_k)),$$

i.e.,

$$\frac{f_{k-2}(\mu_k)}{f_{k-1}(\mu_k)} = \frac{1+\mu_k}{\mu_k} = 1 + \frac{1}{\mu_k}.$$

On the other hand,

$$f_{k-2}(\mu_k) = f_{k-1}(\mu_k) + e^{-\mu_k} \frac{\mu_k^{k-2}}{(k-2)!},$$

it follows immediately that

$$\frac{\mu_k e^{-\mu_k} \mu_k^{k-2}}{(k-2)! f_{k-1}(\mu_k)} = 1.$$

Multiply both sides by $1/(k-1)$, we get

$$\frac{e^{-\mu_k} \mu_k^{k-1}}{(k-1)! f_{k-1}(\mu_k)} = \frac{1}{k-1}. \tag{5.1}$$

The left hand side is a decreasing function of μ_k on $[k, \infty)$. Moreover, taking $\widehat{\mu} = k$, we have $f_{k-1}(\widehat{\mu}) \ge 1/2$ and so,

$$\frac{e^{-\widehat{\mu}} \widehat{\mu}^{k-1}}{(k-1)! f_{k-1}(\widehat{\mu})} \le 2 \frac{e^{-k} k^k}{k!} \le C/\sqrt{k},$$

for some constant $C > 0$ by Stirling's approximation. Since $C/\sqrt{k}$ is larger than $1/(k-1)$ for all large k, we have $\mu_k \ge \widehat{\mu} = k$ for all large k. So, $f_{k-1}(\mu_k) \ge 1/2$.

Let $x = \mu_k - k$ ($x \ge 0$ as $\mu_k \ge k$). Then using Stirling's formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_{k-1}(\mu_k) &= \mu_k \frac{e^{-\mu_k} \mu_k^{k-2}}{(k-2)!} \sim \frac{(k+x) e^{-x-2}}{\sqrt{2\pi k}} \left(1 + \frac{x+2}{k-2}\right)^{k-2} \\ &= \frac{(k+x) e^{-x-2}}{\sqrt{2\pi k}} \exp\left(x + 2 - \frac{(x+2)^2}{2(k-2)} + O(x^3/k^2)\right) \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{k}(1 + O(x/k))}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{(x+2)^2}{2(k-2)} + O(x^3/k^2)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$-\frac{(x+2)^2}{2(k-2)}+O(x^3/k^2)=-\frac{1}{2}\log k+\log(\sqrt{2\pi}f_{k-1}(\mu_k)(1+O(x/k))).$$

It follows immediately that $\mu_k = k+\sqrt{k\log k}+O(\sqrt{k/\log k})$. Then, by (5.1) and the fact that $f_{k-1}(\mu_k), f_k(\mu_k)=\Omega(1)$,

$$d_k=\mu_k\left(1+\frac{e^{-\mu_k}\mu_k^{k-1}}{(k-1)!f_k(\mu_k)}\right)=\mu_k(1+O(1/k))=\mu_k+O(1)=k+\sqrt{k\log k}+O(\sqrt{k/\log k}).$$

Since $\mu_k=k+\sqrt{k\log k}+O(\sqrt{k/\log k})$, it is very easy to verify that $f_k(\mu_k)\to 1$ as $k\to\infty$. ∎

Recall that m_k is the minimum integer m such that G_m contains a k-regular subgraph in the graph evolution process. We will use the following theorem to bound m_k.

Theorem 5.2 (Chan and Molloy [3]) *For all sufficiently large k, and for every $c_{k+1} < c < c_{k+1}+2\sqrt{k\log k}$, a.a.s. the $(k+1)$-core of $\mathcal{G}(n,c/n)$ contains a k-factor or a k-regular subgraph that expands all but one vertex.*

Proof of Theorem 2.6. By Theorems 2.3 and 5.2, for all sufficiently large k, a.a.s. $\mathcal{G}(n,p_1)\subseteq G_{m_k}\subseteq \mathcal{G}(n,p_2)$, where $p_1=(c_k-n^{-1/3})/n$ and $p_2=(c_{k+1}+1)/n$. See [7] for details of the coupling of $\mathcal{G}(n,p_1)$, G_{m_k} and $\mathcal{G}(n,p_2)$. Let $\mathcal{C}_k=\mathcal{C}_k(G_{m_k})$. Then $\mathcal{C}_k$ is non-empty. By Lemma 2.4, the average degree of $\mathcal{C}_k$ is at least $d_k+o(1)$ (asymptotics referring to $n\to\infty$), which is greater than $k+\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{k\log k}$ by Lemma 2.5. Since a.a.s. $G_{m_k}\subseteq\mathcal{G}(n,p_2)$, the average degree of $\mathcal{C}_k$ is a.a.s. $k+o(k)$ by Theorem 2.3 (by noting that $\mu f_{k-1}(\mu)/f_k(\mu)$ is an increasing function on $\mu>0$). Then, by Theorem 2.1, there are $(\epsilon_k)_{k\geq 3}$ with $\epsilon_k\to 0$ as $k\to\infty$, such that a.a.s. there is no k-regular subgraph of $\mathcal{C}_k$ with size between $\epsilon_k|\mathcal{C}_k|$ and $(1-\epsilon_k)|\mathcal{C}_k|$. Since $G_{m_k}\subseteq\mathcal{G}(n,p_2)$ and $p_2\leq 2k/n$, by Lemma 5.1, a.a.s. there is no k-regular subgraph of G_{n,p_2} (and hence of G_{m_k}) with size at most $\epsilon_0|\mathcal{C}_k|\leq\epsilon_0 n$, where $\epsilon_0=1/4e$. Since $\epsilon_k\to 0$ as $k\to\infty$, we have $\epsilon_0\geq\epsilon_k$ for all sufficiently large k. Then, for all large k, there is no k-regular subgraph with size at most $(1-\epsilon_k)|\mathcal{C}_k|$. By Theorem 2.2, there is $0<\sigma_k\to 0$ as $k\to\infty$, such that a.a.s. there is no k-regular subgraph of $\mathcal{C}_k$ with size greater than $(1-\sigma_k)|\mathcal{C}|$. This completes the proof for Theorem 2.6. ∎

Proof of Theorem 2.7. Consider $c>c_k$ and $c=k+o(k)$. Let μ be the larger solution of $\mu/f_{k-1}(\mu)=c$. Then $\mu>\mu_k$ and $\mu=k+o(k)$ and $f_{k-1}(\mu)\to 1$ as $k\to\infty$. By Theorem 2.1, there are $(\epsilon_k)_{k\geq 3}$ with $\epsilon_k\to 0$ as $k\to\infty$, such that a.a.s. there is no k-regular subgraph of $\mathcal{C}_k$ with size between $\epsilon_k|\mathcal{C}_k|$ and $(1-\epsilon_k)|\mathcal{C}_k|$. By Lemma 5.1, a.a.s. there is no k-regular subgraph of $G_{n,c/n}$ with size at most $\epsilon_0|\mathcal{C}_k|\leq\epsilon_0 n$, where $\epsilon_0=1/4e$. Since $\epsilon_k\to 0$ as $k\to\infty$, we have $\epsilon_0\geq\epsilon_k$ for all but finitely many k. For each k such that $\epsilon_0<\epsilon_k$, redefine $\epsilon_k=1-\epsilon_0$. Then, for all $k\geq 3$, there is no k-regular subgraph with size at most $(1-\epsilon_k)|\mathcal{C}_k|$. By Theorem 2.2, there is $0<\sigma_k\to 0$ as $k\to\infty$, such that a.a.s. there is no k-regular subgraph of $\mathcal{C}_k$ with size greater than $(1-\sigma_k)|\mathcal{C}|$. This completes the proof for Theorem 2.7. ∎

References

[1] B. Bollobás, Random graphs. Second edition. *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*, 73. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001. xviii+498 pp.

[2] B. Bollobás, J. Kim and J. Verstraëte, Regular subgraphs of random graphs, *Random Structures Algorithms* 29 (2006), no. 1, 1-13.

[3] S. Chan and M. Molloy, $(k+1)$-cores have k-factors, *Combin. Probab. Comput.* 21 (2012), no. 6, 882-896.

[4] J. Cain and N. Wormald, Encores on cores, *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 13, RP 81, 2006.

[5] P. Erdős and A. Rényi, On the evolution of random graphs, *Bull. Inst. Internat. Statist.* 38 (1961) 343–347.

[6] P. Gao and N. Wormald, Orientability thresholds for random hypergraphs, preprint available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1009.5489`.

[7] S. Janson and T. Łuczak and A. Ruciński, Random graphs. *Wiley-Interscience Series in Discrete Mathematics and Optimization.* Wiley-Interscience, New York, 2000. xii+333 pp.

[8] B.D. McKay, Asymptotics for symmetric 0-1 matrices with prescribed row sums, *Ars Combinatoria* 19A (1985), 15–25.

[9] B.D. McKay and N.C. Wormald, Asymptotic enumeration by degree sequence of graphs with degrees $o(\sqrt{n})$, *Combinatorica* **11** (1991), 369–382.

[10] B.D. McKay and N.C. Wormald, Asymptotic enumeration by degree sequence of graphs of high degree, *European journal of combinatorics*, **11**, 1990, 565–580.

[11] B. Pittel and J. Spencer and N. Wormald, Sudden emergence of a giant k-core in a random graph, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*,67, no.1, 1996, 111–151.

[12] P. Prałat, J. Verstraëte and N. Wormald, On the threshold for k-regular subgraphs of random graphs, *Combinatorica* 31 (2011), no. 5, 565-581.

[13] B. Pittel and N. Wormald, Asymptotic enumeration of sparse graphs with a minimum degree constraint, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* 101 (2003), no. 2, 249-263.

[14] M. Pretti and M. Weigt, Sudden emergence of q-regular subgraphs in random graphs, *Europhys. Lett.* 75 (2006), no. 1, 8-14.